

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-------------------------|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 10/622,276 | 07/18/2003 | Hagay Cafri | 7962 USA/CPI/ALD/PS | 4203 |
| 7590 08/08/2006 | | EXAMINER | | |
| Patent Counsel, MS/2061 | | | FREAY, CHARLES GRANT | |
| Legal Affairs D | | | | |
| Applied Materials, Inc. | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| P. O. Box 450A | | | 3746 | |
| Santa Clara, CA 95052 | | | DATE MAILED: 08/08/2006 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|------------------|--------------|--|--|
| 10/622,276 | CAFRI ET AL. | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | | |
| Charles G. Freay | 3746 | | |

| | Charles G. Freay | 3746 | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ears on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence add | ress | | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>24 July 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP | LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL | LOWANCE. | | | | | | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods: | wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c | idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C | nce, which FR 41.31; or (3) | | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expires 6 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. | | | | | | | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or | ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing | g date of the final rejecti | on. | | | | | |
| TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). | | | | | | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL | tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da | of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi | iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as | | | | | |
| | plianes with 27 CER 44 27 must be | filed within two month | an af the data of | | | | | |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of th | ns of the date of the appeal. Since | | | | | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, | but prior to the data of filing a brief | will not be entered b | 0001100 | | | | | |
| (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co | nsideration and/or search (see NO | TE below); | ecause | | | | | |
| (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for | | | | | | | | |
| appeal; and/or | tter form for appear by materially re | ducing or simplifying | the issues for | | | | | |
| | (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. | | | | | | | |
| NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1 | | | | | | | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 | 21. See attached Notice of Non-Co | mpliant Amendment | (PTOL-324). | | | | | |
| Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) |): | | | | | | | |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). | llowable if submitted in a separate, | timely filed amendme | ent canceling the | | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | ll be entered and an e | explanation of | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: <u>28 and 29</u> . | | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-10 and 12-21</u> . | | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | ut before or on the date of filing a N d sufficient reasons why the affiday | otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence i | ot be entered s necessary and | | | | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar | overcome all rejections under appe | al and/or appellant fa | ils to provide a | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | on of the status of the claims after e | ntry is below or attacl | ned. | | | | | |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by | ut does NOT place the application is | n condition for allowa | nce because: | | | | | |
| 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). | (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N | No(s) | | | | | | |
| 13. | | Charles G Freay Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3746 | W | | | | | |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 7-05) Continuation of 3. NOTE: The limitation of one of the first and second nested structure being a concentric arrangement of a bellows and a rubberized support has not been previously considered. Further the limitations of the concentric arrangement being the first nested structure would be new matter.